



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,941	09/05/2003	Ryuichi Sato	040894-5949	5489
9629 7590 10/16/2007 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			EXAMINER MORRISON, THOMAS A	
			ART UNIT 3653	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/654,941

Applicant(s)

RYUICHI SATO

Examiner

Thomas A. Morrison

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8 and 12-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,398,214 (Moteki et al.).

Regarding claim 6, Figs. 1-10 show a sheet processing apparatus (Fig. 1) comprising:

a compiling tray (30) for receiving and stacking conveyed sheets;

a longitudinal reference wall (31) for performing alignment of sheets stacked on the compiling tray (30) by aligning rear ends of the sheets;

a longitudinal alignment portion (including 50) that gives a conveyance force to sheets sequentially supplied to the compiling tray (30) to push the supplied sheets against the longitudinal reference wall (31), the longitudinal alignment portion (50) being a paddle member; and

a controller that controls a position of the longitudinal alignment portion (including 50) in a direction of thickness of sheets stacked on the compiling tray (30) (see e.g., structure in Figs. 3B-3C, column 6, lines 45-56 and column 7, lines 53-56).

Moreover, Figs. 1-10 show that the longitudinal alignment portion (including 50) conveys the sheet to the longitudinal reference wall (31) by using a member (Fig. 4C) that turns by simultaneously touching a surface of the sheet when placed at a sheet alignment position (Fig. 4A).

In addition, Figs. 1-10 show that the longitudinal alignment portion (including 50) once moves from the sheet alignment position (Fig. 4A) to a sheet pressing position (Fig. 4B) in synchronization with predetermined sheet conveying timing, and then returns to the sheet alignment position (Fig. 4A).

Regarding claim 8, as best understood, the controller controls a reference position of the longitudinal alignment portion according to the number of sheets stacked on the compiling tray (30). See e.g., column 3, lines 16-20.

2. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,220,592 (Watanabe et al.).

Regarding claim 6, Figs. 1-62 show a sheet processing apparatus (Fig. 1) comprising:

- a compiling tray (12) for receiving and stacking conveyed sheets;
- a longitudinal reference wall (33) for performing alignment of sheets stacked on the compiling tray (12) by aligning rear ends of the sheets;
- a longitudinal alignment portion (including 31) that gives a conveyance force to sheets sequentially supplied to the compiling tray (12) to push the supplied sheets against the longitudinal reference wall (33), the longitudinal alignment portion (including 31) being a paddle member; and

a controller that controls a position of the longitudinal alignment portion (including 31) in a direction of thickness of sheets stacked on the compiling tray (12)(see e.g., Figs. 13-16 and column 14, lines 12-38).

Moreover, Figs. 1-62 show that the longitudinal alignment portion (including 31) conveys the sheet to the longitudinal reference wall (33) by using a member (Fig. 15) that turns by simultaneously touching a surface of the sheet when placed at a sheet alignment position (e.g., Fig. 15).

In addition, Figs. 1-62 show that the longitudinal alignment portion (including 31) once moves from the sheet alignment position (Fig. 15) to a sheet pressing position (Fig. 13) in synchronization with predetermined sheet conveying timing, and then returns to the sheet alignment position (Fig. 15).

Regarding claim 8, as best understood, the controller controls a reference position of the longitudinal alignment portion according to the number of sheets stacked on the compiling tray (12). See e.g., column 14, lines 12-21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-5 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,220,592 (Watanabe et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,371,471 (Fukazu et al.).

Regarding claim 1, Figs. 1-62 of Watanabe et al. show a sheet processing apparatus (Fig. 1) comprising:

a compiling tray (12) for forming a sheet bundle by sequentially collecting sheets supplied thereto;

a sheet alignment portion (including 33) for aligning sheets supplied to the compiling tray (12); and

a pressing member (including 17b), provided in such a way as to be able to advance and retract in a direction of thickness of the sheets collected in the compiling tray (12), for holding sheets already collected in the compiling tray (12) and aligned in the sheet alignment portion (including 33) when a new sheet is supplied to the compiling tray (12); and

a controller that controls the pressing member (including 17b) according to a thickness of sheets collected on the compiling tray (12). See e.g., column 14, lines 14-30.

Moreover, the pressing member (including 17b) is provided in such a way as to advance and retract between an advancing position (Fig. 13), at which the pressing member (including 17b) presses sheets on the compiling tray (12), and a retreating position (Fig. 14) at which the pressing member (including 17b) does not hinder the sheets on the compiling tray (12) from being discharged therefrom.

In addition, the pressing member (including 17b) is provided at a downstream side of a supplying direction of the sheets above the compiling tray (12).

In addition, the Watanabe et al. patent discloses that papers are supplied to the Watanabe apparatus from an image forming apparatus. See e.g., column 1, lines 5-10. Moreover, Watanabe et al. discloses that advancing and retracting operations of the pressing member (including 17b) vary according to the thickness of the sheets on the compiling tray (12). See e.g., column 14, lines 14-30. However, Watanabe et al. does not specifically show that advancing and retracting operations of the pressing member vary according to whether or not folding is performed on sheets newly supplied to the compiling tray, as claimed.

The Fukazu et al. patent discloses that it is well known to supply sheets to a sheet processing apparatus (500) from an image forming apparatus (300) via a folder (400), for the purpose of folding the sheets prior to supplying such sheets to the sheet

Art Unit: 3653

processing apparatus (500). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Watanabe et al. apparatus on an image forming apparatus having a folder for the purpose of folding the sheets prior to supplying such sheets to the Watanabe et al. apparatus, as taught by Fukazu et al.

Providing the Watanabe et al. apparatus on an image forming apparatus having a folder will result in folded sheets being supplied to the Watanabe et al. apparatus. Since the advancing and retracting operations of the pressing member (including 17b) vary according to the thickness of the sheets on the compiling tray (12) and folded sheets from the folder have a greater thickness than non-folded sheets, the advancing and retracting operations of the pressing member will vary according to whether or not folding is performed on sheets newly supplied to the compiling tray, as claimed. In other words, folding will result in thicker sheets added to the compiling tray (12), which will then cause the pressing member to operate based on these thicker sheets. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 1 are met.

Regarding claim 3, Figs. 1-62 of Watanabe et al. show a guide member (20), provided in such a way as to be able to be interlocked with the pressing member (including 17b), for guiding a sheet newly supplied to the compiling tray (12).

Regarding claim 4, providing the Watanabe et al. apparatus on an image forming apparatus having a folder, in a manner as taught by Fukazu et al., will result in the advancing and retracting operations of the pressing member (including 17b) varying according to what supply portions supply new sheets to the compiling tray (12). More specifically, the image forming apparatus can supply (1) thin non-folded sheets directly

Art Unit: 3653

to the compiling tray (12) by bypassing the folding operation in the folder or (2) thick (i.e., folded) sheets from the image forming apparatus and the folder. Such thick or thin sheets will result in variation of the advancing and retracting operations of the pressing member (including 17b). Thus, all of the limitations of claim 4 are met.

Regarding claim 5, as best understood, Figs. 1-62 of Watanabe et al. show that the pressing member (including 17b) presses sheets already collected on the compiling tray (12) before a leading end of a sheet newly supplied to the compiling tray (12) touches the sheets already collected thereon, and wherein the pressing member (including 17b) goes away from the collected sheets before a rear end of the newly supplied sheet is discharged onto the compiling tray (12).

Regarding claim 12, Figs. 1-62 of Watanabe et al. show a sheet processing apparatus (Fig. 1) comprising:

- a compiling tray (12) for receiving and stacking supplied sheets;

- a longitudinal reference wall (33) for performing alignment of sheets stacked on the compiling tray (12) by aligning rear ends of the sheets;

- a first moving-aside unit (including 32) for moving the sheets aside toward the longitudinal reference wall (33) at a rear end side of the sheets supplied to the compiling tray (12); and

- a second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) for moving the sheets aside toward the longitudinal reference wall (33) at a leading end side of each of the sheets,

Art Unit: 3653

wherein the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) is provided closer to the leading end side than the first moving-aside unit (32);

a conveyance force of the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) is used for moving the sheets aside toward the longitudinal reference wall (33), and set therein in such a way as to be variable. Also, the Watanabe et al. patent discloses that papers are supplied to the Watanabe apparatus from an image forming apparatus. See e.g., column 1, lines 5-10. Moreover, Watanabe et al. discloses that the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) is set in a way that varies according to the thickness of the sheets on the compiling tray (12). See e.g., column 14, lines 14-30. However, Watanabe et al. does not specifically show that the second moving-aside unit is set in a manner that varies according to whether or not folding is performed on sheets stacked on the compiling tray, as claimed.

The Fukazu et al. patent discloses that it is well known to supply sheets to a sheet processing apparatus (500) from an image forming apparatus (300) via a folder (400), for the purpose of folding the sheets prior to supplying such sheets to the sheet processing apparatus (500). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Watanabe et al. apparatus on an image forming apparatus having a folder for the purpose of folding the sheets prior to supplying such sheets to the Watanabe et al. apparatus, as taught by Fukazu et al. Providing the Watanabe et al. apparatus on an image forming apparatus having a folder will result in folded sheets being supplied to the Watanabe et al. apparatus. Since the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) is set in a way that varies according to

the thickness of the sheets on the compiling tray (12) and folded sheets from the folder have a greater thickness than non-folded sheets, the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) will be set in a manner that varies according to whether or not folding is performed on sheets newly supplied to the compiling tray, as claimed. In other words, folding will result in thicker sheets added to the compiling tray (12), which will then cause the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) to operate based on these thicker sheets. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 12 are met.

Regarding claim 13, Figs. 13-15 of Watanabe et al. show that the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) is enabled to move in a direction of thickness of a sheet bundle accommodated in the compiling tray (12).

Regarding claim 14, Figs. 13-15 of Watanabe et al. show that the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) changes a position thereof in a direction of thickness of a sheet bundle according to the sheet bundle stacked on the compiling tray (12). See also column 14, lines 12-21 of Watanabe et al.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 8/3/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues.

The Office Action equates the longitudinal alignment portion with the return roller 50 of Moteki. Claim 6 calls for "the longitudinal alignment portion being a paddle member." By contrast, Moteki's return roller can hardly be considered a paddle member. See col. 7, lines 36- 48 of Motel6. Accordingly, Moteki fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 6. Thus, the rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

In response, Figs. 4A-4D and 9A-9B clearly show that element 50 is not a completely round roller member. Rather, element 50 has a spring loaded pivoting member (Fig. 9B) that contacts sheets (S) and conveys such sheets (S) to element 31. The dictionary defines the term "paddle" as "A paddle-shaped limb or appendage; a flipper." See Webster's New International Dictionary, 2nd Ed. (1939), at page 1751. With this definition in mind, it is the examiner's position that the spring-loaded member (Fig. 9B) of element 50 can be considered a paddle-shaped limb or appendage, or a flipper. In other words, it is the examiner's position that the spring-loaded member (Fig. 9B) of element 50 can be considered a paddle, as defined by the dictionary. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 6 are met by Moteki.

Then, applicant argues

Newly amended independent claim 6 recites, in part, "wherein the longitudinal alignment portion conveys the sheet to said longitudinal reference wall by using a member that turns by simultaneously touching a surface of said sheet when placed at a sheet alignment position, and wherein said longitudinal alignment portion once moves from said sheet alignment position to a sheet pressing position in synchronization with predetermined sheet conveying timing, and then returns to said sheet alignment position." Watanabe fails to teach or suggest at least these features of claim 6.

The Office Action equates the longitudinal alignment portion with the paddle 31 of Watanabe. But the Office Action does not adequately explain how the paddle 31 moves from the sheet alignment position in Fig. 15 to the sheet pressing position in Fig. 13. See col. 11, lines 31-59 of Watanabe.

In response, when a sheet is fed, elements 20, 17b and 31 move to the positions shown in Figs. 13 and 15. When elements 20, 17b and 31 are in the position shown in Fig. 15 (i.e., the alignment position), the longitudinal alignment portion (including 31) conveys the sheet (P) to the longitudinal reference wall (33) by using a member that

Art Unit: 3653

turns by simultaneously touching a surface of the sheet (P) when placed at a sheet alignment position (Fig. 15). More specifically, the member (31) of the alignment portion (including 31) is shown turning in the direction of the curved arrow in Fig. 15 and also the member (31) is shown touching the top surface of the sheet (P) as it rotates. Thus, Watanabe et al. meets this limitation of claim 6.

Next, applicant argues

Further, the Office Action does not explain how "said longitudinal alignment portion once moves from said sheet alignment position to a sheet pressing position in synchronization with predetermined sheet conveying timing, and then returns to said sheet alignment position," as recited in newly amended claim 6. That is, the Office Action recites the claim language and points to Figs. 13 and 15 of Watanabe, but it does not explain or cite any part of the Watanabe specification where it describes the alleged features. Accordingly, Watanabe fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of newly amended claim 6. Thus, the rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

In response, a sheet or sheets enter the Watanabe et al. apparatus with elements 20, 17b and 31 in the positions shown in Fig. 13. In these positions shown in Fig. 13, elements 17b and 17a act to press on the sheet or sheets. Thus, this position can be considered a sheet pressing position. After this, elements 20, 17b and 31 move to the positions shown in Fig. 15 (i.e., the alignment position) where element 31 aligns the sheet or sheets against element 33. Thus, the longitudinal alignment portion (including 31) can be considered to be in the alignment position (Fig. 15). At some later point in time, elements 20, 17b and 31 move again to the positions shown in Fig. 13 to receive another sheet or sheets. While moving to the position shown in Fig. 13, the longitudinal alignment portion (including 31) moves together with element 20. Thus, the

Art Unit: 3653

longitudinal alignment portion (including 31) moves to the position where elements 17a and 17b press on the sheet or sheets (i.e., the sheet pressing position in Fig. 13). This scenario meets the above limitations of claim 6. Thus, Watanabe et al. meets the limitations of claim 6 as now amended.

Then, applicant argues

Newly amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, "advancing and retracting operations of said pressing member vary according to whether or not folding is performed on sheets newly supplied to said compiling tray; said pressing member is provided at a downstream side of a supplying direction of said sheets above said compiling tray." Similarly, independent claim 12 recites, in part, "a conveyance force of said second moving-aside unit is used for moving said sheets aside toward said longitudinal reference wall, and set therein in such a way as to be variable; and said second moving-aside unit is set in a manner that varies according to whether or not folding is performed on sheets stacked on said compiling

tray." *Watanabe or Fukazu*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of claims 1 and 12.

The Office Action equates the movable delivery roller 17b as the claimed pressing member. Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, *Watanabe's* movable delivery roller 17b is not "said pressing member [] provided at a downstream side of a supplying direction of said sheets above said compiling tray." See col. 7, lines 22-50 of *Watanabe*. As can be seen in Figs. 13-15 of *Watanabe*, the movable delivery roller 17b is a part of rocking guide 20 and it is provided at an upstream side of a supplying direction of said sheets, not a downstream side. Accordingly, *Watanabe* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. *Fukazu* does not cure this deficiency in *Watanabe*. Thus, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

In response, col. 10, lines 59-67 of *Watanabe et al.* explain that sheets are delivered along guide 11 to the downstream roller pair 17. Such sheets are delivered above the compiling tray 12. Thus, element 17b can be considered a pressing member

Art Unit: 3653

(including 17b) provided at a downstream side of a supplying direction of the sheets above the compiling tray (12), as now set forth in claim 1.

Next, applicant argues

Further, the Office Action states "Watanabe et al. does not specifically show that the second moving-aside unit is set in a manner that varies according to whether or not folding is performed on sheets stacked on the compiling tray." It relies upon Fukazu for this teaching. Contrary the assertions in the Office Action, Fukazu does not provide this teaching either. Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner provide reference to Fukazu where it is taught that the moving-aside unit varies according to whether or not folding is performed. Assumptions are not evidence of this teaching. Accordingly, Watanabe fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 12. Fukazu does not cure this deficiency in Watanabe. Thus, the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

As mentioned above in the rejection of claim 12, Watanabe et al. discloses that the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) is set in a way that varies according to the thickness of the sheets on the compiling tray (12). See e.g., column 14, lines 14-30 of Watanabe et al.

Moreover, as mentioned above in the rejection of claim 12, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Watanabe et al. apparatus on an image forming apparatus having a folder for the purpose of folding the sheets prior to supplying such sheets to the Watanabe et al. apparatus, as taught by Fukazu et al. Providing the Watanabe et al. apparatus on an image forming apparatus having a folder will result in folded sheets (thicker sheets) being supplied to the Watanabe et al. apparatus. Since the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) is set in a way that varies according to the thickness of the sheets on the compiling tray (12) and folded sheets from the folder have a greater thickness

Art Unit: 3653

than non-folded sheets, the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) will be set in a manner that varies according to whether or not folding is performed on sheets newly supplied to the compiling tray, as claimed. In other words, folding will result in thicker sheets added to the compiling tray (12), which will then cause the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20) to operate based on these thicker sheets. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 12 are met. No assumptions are made in the above argument. Clearly, folded sheets are thicker than unfolded sheets (i.e., two layers folded are thicker than one unfolded layer). These thicker folded sheets will affect the movement of the second moving-aside unit (including 31 and 20), as explained in col. 14, lines 14-30 of Watanabe et al. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 12 are met by this combination of references.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7221. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Mackey can be reached on (571) 272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

10/14/2007


PATRICK MACKEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600